REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Claim 7 has been cancelled.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Zheng for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on September 11, 2007. The Examiner was contacted to discuss proposed amendments to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 112, of claims 1-7 and 10-31 and agreement was reached. No agreement was reached with respect to the 103 rejections of claims 1-36.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 10-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-7 and 10-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended and are submitted to be directed to statutory subject matter. In particular, these independent claims have been amended to make clear that the claimed invention is implemented by a processor.

II. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been cancelled.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cymerman (Michael Cymerman, Automate your build process using Java and Ant) in view of Jerger (US 6,321,334). The present invention provides a mechanism called "sandboxing" of a build platform that allows a developer to safely download, use, and augment their build processes. In one implementation, sandboxing allows the developer to mark different build entities as fully trusted, semi-trusted or untrusted. Without

sandboxing, developers would be forced to fully trust all build processes, both the processes generated by the developer as well as processes generated by the community or third parties. At least three major entities that can interact with the build process include operating system users/groups, project files, and assemblies bound to the build process such as tasks and loggers. All of these entities can provide the potential for compromising a machine through the build platform. At build time, the permission under which the build platform executes is determined by the intersection of the levels of trust allowed by each entity. Toward that end, claim 1 (and similarly claims 11, 20, and 32) recite *a build process processor that processes one or more build entities; and* ***a policy component that is processed by the build process processor to determine one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates***. The cited art fails to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Cymerman merely discloses an automated build process. Jerger merely discloses that one way in which browsers have addressed the security problem presented by potentially harmful software components is to notify the user prior to performing a potentially harmful operation while the software component is running on the host system (at column 2 lines 27-31). Notably lacking is any reference to ***a policy component that is processed by the build process processor to determine one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates***. Additionally, the combination is unsupported. Only the bare assertion in the Office Action that "One would have been motivated to do so to secure the build process by automatically administering the decision to grant or deny permissions to specific build entities as suggested by Jerger (see for example, col 2, lines 27-51) supports the combination. Moreover, Jerger does not suggest *granting or denying permissions to specific build entities.* Rather Jerger states that one way in which browsers have addressed the security problem presented by potentially harmful software components is to notify the user prior to performing a potentially harmful operation while the software component is running on the host system. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-36 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731